NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

B186649

Plaintiff and Respondent,

(Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. BA279280)

v.

DEJUAN RAYMOND ESTRADA,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Paul M.

Enright, Temporary Judge. (Pursuant to Cal. Const., art. VI, §21.) Affirmed

Jonathan B. Steiner and Jill Ishida, under appointments by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

DeJuan Raymond Estrada appeals from judgment entered following a jury trial in which he was convicted of selling cocaine. (Health & Saf. Code, § 11352, subd. (a)) He also admitted he suffered four prior felony convictions and served prison terms within the meaning of Penal Code section 667.5 and a prior serious or violent felony within the meaning of Penal Code sections 1170.12, subdivisions (a) through (d) and 667, subdivisions (b) through (i). The court struck all but one prior prison term conviction and sentenced appellant to prison for seven years.

After review of the record, appellant's court-appointed counsel filed an opening brief requesting this court to independently review the record pursuant to the holding of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.

On March 20, 2006, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that no arguable issues exist, and that appellant has, by virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment entered against him in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278.)

DISPOSITION

| 701 ' | • 1 | . • | cc. | 1 |
|--------------|------------|-----|------------------|--------------|
| Iha | เบเสดหากกา | 10 | Ottiem. | αd |
| 1110 | judgmen | | <i>a</i> 1111111 | C (1) |
| | 1005111011 | | ********* | |

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

| | HASTINGS, J.* |
|----------------|---------------|
| We concur: | |
| EPSTEIN, P. J. | |
| WILLHITE, J. | |

^{*}Retired Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.